

Tatjana Stanovic¹
Maja Bacovic
Sanja Pekovic
Jelena Jovanovic
Ivan Savovic

THE ROLE OF HUMAN RESOURCE PRACTICES ON PROFITS GENERATED BY THE INNOVATIONS: THE ROLE OF TOP MANAGEMENT SUPPORT AND REGULARITY OF EMPLOYEES MEETINGS

Article info:

Received 06.04.2016

Accepted 13.10.2016

UDC – 332.05

DOI – 10.18421/IJQR10.04-13

Abstract: Previous scholars argue that human resource practices advance valuable knowledge what could be reflected positively on innovations. Accordingly, we empirically investigate whether human resource related practices such as top management support and regularity of employees meetings are related to profit generated by the innovation activities. Using survey data of Montenegrin firms, we find that firms in which top management supports employees' idea and have regular employees meetings related to innovation activities are likely to report higher profit generated by innovations. Therefore, our results underline the crucial role of human resource practices in the process of innovation that generates profitability for firms.

Keywords: innovation, profit, human resource practices, top management support, meetings

1. Introduction

Innovation is recognized as key to economic progress because it drives to improved productivity and competitive gains (Pekovic and Galia, 2009). Similarly, scholars also argue that firms engage in innovation are motivated by number of reasons such as products, markets, efficiency, quality or the ability to learn and to implement changes. OECD (2005) defines innovation as the introduction of new products and/or services, a new marketing plan, a new process, or a new organisational method for business practice relating to internal or external relations of business (OECD, 2005).

Due its importance for economic growth, the literature examines and distinguishes three dimensions enhancing innovation, such as: factor conditions (human resources, basic research infrastructure, information infrastructure and the supply of capital risk), supporting environment (competition, innovation incentives, presence of clusters, and local suppliers) and demand conditions (sophisticated customers, anticipated needs) (e.g. Pekovic and Galia, 2009). What more, Youndtet *et al.* (1996) acknowledge particular importance to employees for innovation activities development. Actually, it is considered that human capital is more likely to produce a competitive advantage because they are difficult to imitate.

¹ Corresponding author: Tatjana Stanovic
email: stanja@ac.me

Additionally, it is underlined that due to present competitive dynamics, managing human resources appropriately is the only truly sustainable source of competitive advantage (Reich, 1990). In fact, more effective systems of human resources practices influence employee skills through the acquisition and development of a firm's human capital, which itself provides a direct and economically significant contribution to a firm's performance (Huselid, 1995). In the same sense, Snell and Youndt (1995) underlined that firm's success or failure is influenced on the way individuals are managed. The previous scholars confirmed positive relationship between human resources practices and firm performance (MacDuffie, 1995; Delaney and Huselid, 1996; Ichniowski *et al.*, 1997; Fey and Bjorkman, 2001). For instance, using a panel data Jones *et al.*, (2010) find that appropriate utilisation of human resource practices enhances productivity.

Consequently, it is important to identify the human resources factors that lead firms to generate more value from their innovations. As argued by Cheng and Huang (2009) human resource (HR) practices are the most important tool by which firms can shape the skills, attitudes and behaviour of employees to do their work what would be reflected on improved organizational outcomes. Similarly, Youndt *et al.* (1996) note that HR activities play a central role in linking employee capabilities with the firm performance. Therefore, employees working under HR practices represent a source of competitive advantages. These practices encompass various job characteristics including job rotation, learning across tasks, teamwork, decentralization of responsibility, top managers support, worker participation in decision making, etc. Previous scholars confirm the positive relationship between HR practices and firm performance (e.g. Youndt *et al.*, 1996; Huselid *et al.*, 1997; Ichniowski *et al.*, 1997). However, less is known concerning HR practices and innovation performance (Laursen and Foss,

2003; Cheng and Huang, 2009). The rationale for positive relation between HR practices and innovation could be based on the fact that HR practices through the capacity in knowledge acquisition, sharing, and application generate positive effects on innovation performance (Cheng and Huang, 2009). Employing sample of 146 firms, Cheng and Huang (2009) support the positive relationship between HR practices and innovation. The authors suggest that managers need to actively enhance human capital through variety of HR practices. Similarly, estimating an empirical model of innovation performance, using data from a Danish survey of 1,900 business firms, Laursen and Foss (2003) identify two HRM systems which are conducive to innovation. Moreover, Beugelsdijk (2008) worked on a sample of 988 Dutch firms and found that task autonomy, training and performance-based pay are important for generating incremental innovations. Regarding radical innovations, the author's results underline the importance of task autonomy and flexible working hours.

Our focus in this research is on the innovation effects of HR practices. In particular, this paper will examine the impact of two HR practices namely top management support and employee's meeting regularity on profit generated by innovation on the sample of Montenegrin firms. Noteworthy, empirical research has been restricted to papers that provide analysis how top managers influences firm financial performance. Accordingly, Hermans and Martín-Cruz (2016) addressed top managers' role from three key perspectives: (1) the agency theory that focuses on the costs associated with the separation between firm property and control; (2) firms are a reflection of their key decision-makers (i.e., top managers) and their characteristics will influence firm performance; (3) organizational behaviour theory, explores the questions of how a CEO's leadership behaviours influence firm outcomes leadership as antecedents of organizational performance. Moreover, the studies that examine the importance of

employee's meeting regularity are also missing in the current literature. It is considered that meetings facilitate communication among members and link employees inside the firm (Urry, 2003). Additionally, Volkema and Niederman (1995) underline that meetings are important part of firm success since they help dissemination of information among employees. Agypt *et al.* (2012) argue that meetings are a valuable venue in which employees can organize their work in relation to the overall firm. In summary, top management support is considered an essential condition for performance improvement (Young and Poon, 2013) while employee's meeting regularity will insure the quality of knowledge and information flow. Our contribution is to add to the emerging theoretical and empirical research on innovation management as well as on human resource management. Moreover, understanding what HR practices drives innovation performance in Montenegro is crucial since it could help firms to achieve better employment of innovation capabilities what would result in higher levels of productivity and at the same time economic growth.

The outline of this paper is as follows: data and empirical methodology description to investigate the relationships between HR practices and innovation is provided in Section 2, followed by results and discussion in Section 3. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Methodology

2.1. Data

The data is extracted from a Montenegrin survey which is created by the Center for Quality in Montenegro. The main objective of the survey is to obtain information concerning firms' behavior regarding innovation activities in Montenegro. The questionnaire contains 31 questions. The survey was conducted in different geographical areas of Montenegro (north,

center and south), from September to the end of December 2011. The time allocated for employees to complete the questionnaire was not limited but it took approximately 5 days. The number of firms that have answered the questionnaire is 120.

2.2. Dependent and Independent Variables

Profit generated by the Innovations. In order to assess innovation, it is important to make the distinction between output of innovation activity and the input into innovation activity (Rogers, 1998). Generally, the key output of innovation activity is the firm's success which may be defined as profits, market share, productivity, etc. Therefore, in this paper the dependent variable presents output of innovation activity. More precisely, the dependent variable denoted Profit generated by the Innovations presents dummy variable which equals 1 if the firm has generated profit from innovation activities more or equals to the mean of the sample used (mean= 2.184874).

Top Management Support. To test our main hypothesis of the paper, namely that HR practices are positively associated with innovation performance, we use variable named Top Management Support coded 1 if respond completely agree or agree that top managers consider and accept suggestions and ideas from employees.

Regularity of Employees Meeting. The second variable that represents HR practices is Regularity of Employees Meetings which is count variable going from (1) employee has never meetings to (5) employee has weekly meeting relating innovation.

In order to control for firm-level heterogeneity, our analysis includes variables representing firm characteristics such as size and sector of activity (e.g. Pekovic and Galia, 2009). In Table 1 we present descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations for our sample. No problem of multi-collinearity was detected among variables.

Table 1. Pearson correlation coefficients

	Variable	Mean	S.D.	Min.	Max	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Profit generated by the Innovations	0.26	0.43	0.00	1.00	1.00	-	-	-				
2	Top Management Support	0.27	0.45	0.00	1.00	0.15	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	
3	Regularity of Employees Meeting	2.77	1.55	1.00	5.00	0.25	0.04	1.00	-	-	-	-	
4	Size	156.49	240.38	2.00	1200.00	-0.09	-0.01	0.05	1.00	-	-	-	
5	Manufacturing	0.32	0.47	0.00	1.00	0.04	-0.07	0.04	-0.01	1.00	-	-	
6	Construction	0.11	0.31	0.00	1.00	0.04	0.09	-0.11	-0.14	0.24	1.00	-	
7	Trade	0.21	0.41	0.00	1.00	-0.21	-0.04	0.18	0.04	0.36	0.18	1.00	
8	Service	0.35	0.48	0.00	1.00	-0.23	0.06	-0.11	0.07	0.51	0.26	0.38	1.00

2.3. Estimation Strategy

We use a linear model for underlying HR variables driving innovation:

$$Y_i^* = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{10} \beta_i X_i + \mu_i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (1)$$

where X_i represents the vector of variables for innovation (*Top Management Support*, *Regularity of Employees Meeting*, *Size* and *Sector of Activity*); $\beta_1 - \beta_4$ are slope coefficients to be estimated and α and μ are the intercept and the disturbance term, respectively. The interpretation of the latent variable in this kind of model is typically that of an overall net gain (or profit) originating from HR practices.

The model of firms' choice to invest in HR practices is stated as a discrete-choice model, with the dummy variables indicating innovation as the dependent variable Y_i :

$$Y_i = 1 \text{ if } Y_i^* > 0, \quad (2)$$

$$Y_i = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

We specified logistic distributions for μ and maximized the log-likelihood of the logit model (Greene, 2003) to estimate model's parameters up to a positive constant.

3. Results

Logit estimation results are presented in Table 2. The fit is reasonable with an adjusted pseudo-R-squared of 14% ($p < 0.001$).

The results show that our hypothesized positive relationship between *Top Management Support* and *Profit generated by the Innovation* was supported ($\beta = 0.92$; $p < 0.10$). Furthermore, we proposed a positive relationship between *Regularity of Employees Meeting* and innovation what was also supported ($\beta = 0.37$; $p < 0.05$).

In sum, the empirical results revealed consistent evidence regarding the relationship between two HR practices and innovation performance. The findings are going in the same direction as those from Laursen and Foss (2003), Beugelsdijk (2008) and Cheng and Huang (2009) who find the positive link between HR practices and innovation.

Table 2. The estimated results concerning the relationship between HR practices and Profit generated by the Innovations

Variables	Profit generated by the Innovations	
	Estimate	z-value
Intercept	-3.31 ***	-4.28
Top Management Support	0.92*	1.87
Regularity of Employees Meeting	0.37***	2.37
Size	0.00	-1.06
Manufacturing	1.16*	1.84
Construction	1.29	1.58
Trade	1.79***	2.71
R2	0.14	
LR chi2(6)	19.64	
Prob > chi2	0.00	
Log likelihood	-58.738021	
Number of observations	120	

(*), (**), (***) indicate parameter significance at the 10, 5 and 1 per cent level, respectively. Sector reference: Service sector

The results show that our hypothesized positive relationship between Top Management Support and Profit generated by the Innovation was supported ($\beta = 0.92$; $p < 0.10$). Furthermore, we proposed a positive relationship between Regularity of Employees Meeting and innovation what was also supported ($\beta = 0.37$; $p < 0.05$).

In sum, the empirical results revealed consistent evidence regarding the relationship between two HR practices and innovation performance. The findings are going in the same direction as those from Laursen and Foss (2003), Beugelsdijk (2008) and Cheng and Huang (2009) who find the positive link between HR practices and innovation.

However, we may notice that significance level is higher when looking the relationship between Regularity of Employees Meeting and innovation then between Top Management Support and innovation performance. Consequently, we may argue that Regularity of Employees Meeting is more important for generating profit from innovation in Montenegrin firms. A potential explanation for this is that regular meetings

may further improve employee’s knowledge and process related to information sharing. Turning to control variables we may notice that size and being in construction sector do not influence innovation while being in manufacturing and trade sector increases firm’s probability to generate profit from innovation activities.

5. Conclusions

The purpose of this study is to examine direct approach to HR practices and innovation performance in Montenegrin firms. More precisely, we use two measures for HR practices: Top Management Support and Regularity of Employees Meetings. The obtained findings confirm the notion that HR practices lead to higher profit generated by the innovation activities. Accordingly, this study enriches our understanding of how Montenegrin firms could motivate their employees in order to improve their innovation activities. Notwithstanding, comparing the significance level, our results reveal that Regularity of Employees Meetings are more important for innovation than Top Management Support what we

explained by the fact that having regular meetings broader range of knowledge and information therefore improve innovation performance. Noteworthy, it is argued that top management support is beneficial for firm performance but there is evidence that too much top management support can be dysfunctional and lead to failure (Keil, 1995; Collins and Bicknell, 1997).

The obtained findings provide insights that are relevant to managers in Montenegrin firms. Managers should be aware that HR practices are valuable assets that could help firm to improve its innovation performance what could result in improved sustainable competitive advantages. Therefore, managers should invest more energy to create working environment that enhance HR practices.

The limitations of this study point to several issues for future research avenues. First, we use cross-section data; therefore future research should use panel data in order to confirm the obtained results over time. Second, although this study proposes two measures of HR practices, it could be that other important variables remained unmeasured such as teamwork, decision-making, pay incentives, etc. Third, our paper is based on a sample of Montenegrin firms what limits possibility of providing general conclusion. Due, future research should use multiple countries data in order to overcome this limitation. Finally, future studies should identify relational pathway (mediating factors) through which HR practices contribute to innovation performance.

References:

- Agypt, B., Rubin, B.A. & Spivack, A.J. (2012). Thinking outside the clocks: the effect of layered-task time on the creative climate of meetings, *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, 46(2), 77-98.
- Beugelsdijk, S. (2008). Strategic human resource practices and product innovation, *Organization Studies*, 29(6), 821-847.
- Chen, C. & Huang, J. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance - The mediating role of knowledge management capacity, *Journal of Business Research*, 62(1), 104-114.
- Collins, T. & Bicknell, D. (1997). *Crash: ten easy ways to avoid a computer disaster*. London: Simon and Schuster.
- Delaney, J.T. & Huselid, M.A. (1996). The impact of human resource management practices on perceptions of organizational performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 949-968.
- Fey, C.F. & Bjorkman, I. (2001). The effect of human resource management practices on MNE subsidiary performance in Russia, *Journal of International Business Studies*, 32(1), 59-75.
- Greene, W. (2003). *Econometric Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.
- Hermano, V. & Martín-Cruz, N. (2016). The role of top management involvement in firms performing projects: A dynamic capabilities approach, *Journal of Business Research*, DOI: 10.1016/j.jbusres.2016.01.041
- Huselid, M. (1995). The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover, Productivity, and Corporate Financial Performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 635-672.
- Huselid, M.A., Jackson, S.E. & Schuler, R.S. (1997). Technical and strategic human resource management effectiveness as determinants of firm performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 171-188.

- Ichiniowski, C., Shaw, K. & Prenushi, G. (1997). The effects of human resource management practices on productivity: a study of steel finishing lines, *American Economic Review*, 87(3), 291-313.
- Jones, D.C., Kalmi, P. & Kauhanen, A. (2010). How Does Employee Involvement Stack Up? The Effects of Human Resource Management Policies on Performance in a Retail Firm, *Industrial Relations*, 49(1), 1-21.
- Keil, M. (1995). Pulling the plug: software project management and the problem of project escalation. *MIS Quarterly*, 19(4), 421.
- Laursen, K. & Foss, N. (2003). New human resource management practices, complementarities and the impact on innovation performance, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 27(2), 243-263.
- MacDuffie, J.P. (1995). Human Resource bundles and manufacturing performance: organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 48(2), 197-221.
- OECD (2005). *Oslo Manual-Guidelines for Collecting and Interpreting Innovation Data*, Paris, OECD Publishing.
- Pekovic, S. & Galia, F. (2009). From quality to innovation: Evidence from two French Employer Surveys, *Technovation*, 29(12), 829-842.
- Reich, R.B. (1990). *Who is us?* Hurvurd Business Review, (January-February), 53-64.
- Rogers, M. (1998). The Definition and Measurement of Innovation, *Melbourne Institute Working Paper*, 10/98.
- Urry, J. (2003). Social networks, travel and talk, *British Journal of Sociology*, 54(2), 155-175
- Volkema, R.J. & Niederman, F. (1995). Organizational meetings, *Small Group Research*, 26(1), 3-24.
- Youndt, M.A., Snell, S.A., Dean, J.W. & Lepak, D.P. (1996). Human resource management, manufacturing strategy, and firm performance, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 836-866.
- Young, R. & Poon, S. (2013). Top management support—almost always necessary and sometimes sufficient for success: Findings from a fuzzy set analysis, *International Journal of Project Management*, 31, 943-957.

Tatjana Stanovcic

University of Montenegro,
Montenegro
stanja@ac.me

Maja Bacovic

University of Montenegro,
Montenegro
majab@ac.me

Sanja Pekovic

University of Montenegro,
Montenegro
psanja@ac.me

Jelena Jovanovic

University of Montenegro,
Montenegro
jelenajov@ac.me

Ivan Savovic

University of Kragujevac,
Faculty of Engineering
Serbia
cqm@kg.ac.rs
